

App. No. 10/063,108

**Request for In-Person Interview**

Applicant's representatives request an in-person interview to discuss the subject matter of the application and the status of issues raised by the Examiner.

**REMARKS - General**

By the above amendment, Applicants have amended the title to emphasize the novelty of the invention.

Applicant contends that while the Bansai patent, U.S. Patent number 6,804,805 does contemplate a card concept it does not have the novel and unique function and features of Applicant's invention. It does not address the group gift and contribution process of Applicant's invention. The Applicant's process outlined in the application for inviting "signers" and their donations is different and superior to Bansai. The applicant's process maximizes the viral aspect of the model through the whole system which does not even come up in other referenced applications. The other referenced patents, in Applicant's opinion, do not come close to the tightly integrated approach of Applicant's groupcards where others get invited to sign and contribute to a group gift.

The Nelsen patent application, U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0042775 has a focus on a gift registry system and Applicant's process is far superior in a group gift tied to a group card than that which is put forth in the Nelsen patent application.

The Ganesan patent application, U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0087427 is a one-to-one card offered with cash. Applicant contends that this is not a good comparison to the Applicant's invention, since the system is for a single giver to a single receiver. The applicant's system and invention is a much more complex system as it involves multiple givers and receivers and an electronic environment. Something that simple had not been done prior to Applicant's invention. This is in itself, Applicant believes, a strong argument against the Section 103(a) rejection.

App. No. 10/063,108

The Lomangino Patent Application, U.S. Patent Application 2002/0052756, deals specifically with donation exchange and not tying that exchange to an electronic card. Applicant's invention and process of tying contributions from a number of persons is novel and unique and non-obvious over the Lomangino application as it is a completely different concept.

Applicant contends that the process Applicant has outlined in our application for inviting "signers" and their donations is different and superior to the referenced art. The Applicant has tried to maximize the viral aspect of the model through the whole system which is unique and doesn't even come up in other's applications. None of the referenced art comes close to the tightly integrated approach of groupcards where others get invited to sign and contribute to a group gift.


Applicant also contends that the current invention is not obvious to one skilled in the art based on the extreme marketability of the current invention. Applicant has had a lot of commercial success solely based on licensing the current invention involving products of large well know companies. The Application has attached a Section 1.132 Affidavit as well as additional evidence to support this claim.

Applicants have rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

#### Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over prior art. Therefore the applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey M. Furr, Esq.  
Registration No. 38,146

App. No. 10/063,108

I hereby certify I have transmitted this paper by fax to the Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300 on October 3, 2005.

October 3, 2005..

---

Jeffrey M. Furr, Esq, Reg. No. 38,146.